

REMARKS

Claims 34-39 are currently pending. Claims 34-39 are amended herein.

Reconsideration and allowance of the remaining Claims are respectfully requested.

103 Rejections

Claims 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,424) in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 5,435,772). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as is recited in Claims 34-39 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Evans et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,424) in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 5,435,772).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 34 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a polishing apparatus comprising:

...a carrier overlying the polishing pad, wherein the polishing platen is further characterized as having a tapered region, and wherein the peripheral region of the polishing pad overlies the tapered region.

Claims 35-39 depend from independent Claim 34 and recite further features of the claimed invention.

Evans et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a polishing apparatus that includes a polishing platen, a polishing pad overlying the polishing platen and a carrier overlying the polishing pad and wherein the polishing platen is characterized by "a tapered region, and wherein the peripheral region of the polishing pad overlies the tapered region." Evans only shows a renewable polishing lap. Nowhere in the Evans et al. reference is there shown or suggested a polishing apparatus that includes both a carrier overlying a polishing pad and a

polishing platen that has a tapered region that is overlain by a peripheral region of a polishing pad as is recited in Claim 34. Consequently the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 34-39 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Evans et al.

Yu does not remedy the deficiencies of Evans outlined above. Yu does not anticipate or render obvious a polishing apparatus that includes a polishing platen, a polishing pad overlying the polishing platen, a carrier overlying the polishing pad and wherein the polishing platen is characterized by "a tapered region, and wherein the peripheral region of the polishing pad overlies the tapered region." Yu only shows a method of polishing a semiconductor substrate.

It should be appreciated that the equating of structure 31 of Yu with the recited platen of Claim 1 (in the Office Action) is in error. Structure 31 is disclosed by Yu to be a polishing pad. It should be noted that Yu does teach a platen 14 (see column 3 in several locations) but the platen that is disclosed does not include a tapered portion. In fact, nowhere in the Yu reference is there shown or suggested a polishing apparatus that includes both: (1) a carrier overlying a polishing pad and (2) a polishing platen that has a tapered region that is overlain by a peripheral region of a polishing pad as is recited in Claim 34. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 34-39 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Evans et al.

The Examiner contends in the Office Action that because Yu “teaches the expediency of providing a carrier for the work overlying the polishing pad” for such purposes as controlling the pressure that is exerted against the polishing surface, Evans et al. in view of Yu renders the limitations of Claim 34 obvious. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this contention since even if Yu does teach providing a carrier for the work overlying the polishing pad as contended by the Examiner, the combination of Evans et al. and Yu would not teach the Applicants’ invention as is outlined above.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Evans et al. in view of Yu does not anticipate or render obvious the present Claimed invention as is recited in independent Claim 34 and as such Claim 34 overcomes the Examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 34 is in condition for allowance. In addition, Evans et al. in view of Yu does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as is recited in Claims 35-39 which depends from independent Claim 34, and that Claims 35-39 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 8/5, 2004



Reginald A. Ratliff

Registration No. 48,098

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9060